



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

*W.W.S.*

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/720,859	11/24/2003	Craig L. Reding	03-1013	5176
32127	7590	08/17/2006	EXAMINER	
VERIZON PATENT MANAGEMENT GROUP 1515 N. COURTHOUSE ROAD, SUITE 500 ARLINGTON, VA 22201-2909				ANWAH, OLISA
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		2614		

DATE MAILED: 08/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/720,859	REDING ET AL.	
	Examiner Olisa Anwah	Art Unit 2614	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 June 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-86 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-12,14-36,38-52,54-76 and 78-86 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 13,37,53 and 77 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                     | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
|  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .                                  |

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 16-22 and 56-62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown et al, U.S. Patent No. 7,065,198 (hereinafter Brown) in view of Wyman, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0046071 (hereinafter Wyman).

Regarding claim 16, Brown discloses a method comprising:  
establishing a conference call between a plurality of users, including an initiating user;  
identifying a plurality of destination devices for an audio stream corresponding to the conference call, the destination devices corresponding to the plurality of users;  
providing the audio stream to at least one of the identified destination devices; and  
storing data contained in the audio stream; and

creating a text transcription of at least a portion of the stored audio stream data (see Figures 4 and 19).

With further respect to claim 16, Brown does not teach the text transcription includes a pointer to one or more audio files containing non-transcribed portions of the stored audio stream data. However Wyman discloses this limitation (see Figure 6). And so, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Brown with the voice recognition apparatus of Wyman. This modification would have improved the convenience of Brown by allowing any sounds not recognized as defined words to be represented by an icon that represents an audio clip as suggested by Wyman (see abstract).

Regarding claim 17, see Figure 21 of Brown.

Regarding claim 18, see Figure 7A of Brown.

Regarding claim 19, see Figure 7A of Brown.

Regarding claim 20, see Figure 21 of Brown.

Regarding claim 21, see Figure 21 of Brown.

Regarding claim 22, see Figure 21 of Brown.

Claim 56 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 16.

Regarding claim 57, see Figure 21 of Brown.

Art Unit: 2614

Regarding claim 58, see Figure 7A of Brown.

Regarding claim 59, see Figure 7A of Brown.

Regarding claim 60, see Figure 4 of Brown.

Regarding claim 61, see Figure 21 of Brown.

Regarding claim 62, see Figure 21 of Brown.

3. Claims 1-12, 14, 15, 23-36, 38-52, 54, 55, 63-76 and 78-86 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown in view of Ludwig et al, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0103152 (hereinafter Ludwig).

Regarding claim 1, Brown discloses a method comprising:

establishing a conference call between a plurality of users, including an initiating user;

ascertaining identities of a plurality of destination devices for an audio stream corresponding to the conference call, the destination devices corresponding to the plurality of users;

providing the audio stream to the plurality of destination devices; and

storing data (see the identification from column 9) contained in the audio stream (see Figure 4).

Art Unit: 2614

With further respect to claim 1, Brown does not disclose selectively deleting the identification, while the conference call is ongoing, based on a determination that a user has exited the conference call. Regardless, Ludwig discloses this feature (see paragraph 0161). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Brown with selectively deleting the identification, while the conference call is ongoing, based on a determination that a user has exited the conference call as taught by Ludwig. This modification would have improved the convenience of Brown by notifying all other conference participants that the participant has exited as suggested by both Ludwig (see paragraph 0161) and Brown (see column 6).

Regarding claim 2, see column 11 of Brown.

Regarding claim 3, see column 3 of Brown.

Regarding claim 4, see column 4 of Brown.

Regarding claim 5, see Figure 10 of Brown.

Regarding claim 6, see Figure 4 of Brown.

Regarding claim 7, see Figure 7A of Brown.

Regarding claim 8, see Figure 7A of Brown.

Regarding claim 9, see Figures 21 and 24 of Brown.

Regarding claim 10, see Figures 21 and 24 of Brown.

Art Unit: 2614

Regarding claim 11, see Figures 21 and 24 of Brown.

Regarding claim 12, see Figure 21 of Brown.

Regarding claim 14, see Figure 32 of Brown.

Regarding claim 15, see column 3 of Brown.

Claim 23 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 12.

Claim 24 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1.

Regarding claim 25, see column 11 of Brown.

Regarding claim 26, see column 4 of Brown.

Regarding claim 27, see Figure 10 of Brown.

Regarding claim 28, see Figure 21 of Brown.

Regarding claim 29, see Figure 7A of Brown.

Regarding claim 30, see Figure 7A of Brown.

Claim 31 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1.

Regarding claim 32, see Figure 7A of Brown.

Regarding claim 33, see Figures 21 and 24 of Brown.

Regarding claim 34, see Figures 21 and 24 of Brown.

Regarding claim 35, see Figures 21 and 24 of Brown.

Regarding claim 36, see Figure 21 of Brown.

Regarding claim 38, see Figure 7A of Brown.

Regarding claim 39, see Figures 7A-B of Brown.

Regarding claim 40, see Figure 21 of Brown.

Claim 41 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1.

Regarding claim 42, see column 11 of Brown.

Art Unit: 2614

Regarding claim 43, see column 3 of Brown.

Regarding claim 44, see Figure 4 of Brown.

Regarding claim 45, see Figure 10 of Brown.

Regarding claim 46, see Figure 4 of Brown.

Regarding claim 47, see Figure 7A of Brown.

Regarding claim 48, see Figure 7A of Brown.

Regarding claim 49, see Figures 21 and 24 of Brown.

Regarding claim 50, see Figures 21 and 24 of Brown.

Regarding claim 51, see Figures 21 and 24 of Brown.

Regarding claim 52, see Figure 21 of Brown.

Regarding claim 54, see Figure 32 of Brown.

Regarding claim 55, see column 3 of Brown.

Claim 63 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 64 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1.

Regarding claim 65, see column 11 of Brown.

Regarding claim 66, see Figure 4 of Brown.

Regarding claim 67, see Figure 10 of Brown.

Regarding claim 68, see Figure 4 of Brown.

Regarding claim 69, see Figure 7A of Brown.

Regarding claim 70, see Figure 7A of Brown.

Claim 71 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1.

Regarding claim 72, see Figure 7A of Brown.

Regarding claim 73, see Figures 21 and 24 of Brown.

Art Unit: 2614

Regarding claim 74, see Figures 21 and 24 of Brown.

Regarding claim 75, see Figures 21 and 24 of Brown.

Regarding claim 76, see Figure 21 of Brown.

Regarding claim 78, see Figure 7A of Brown.

Regarding claim 79, see Figures 7A-B of Brown.

Regarding claim 80, see Figure 21 of Brown.

Claim 81 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 82 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 83 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 84 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 85 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 86 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 12.

#### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

4. Claims 13, 37, 53 and 77 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant's arguments have been considered but are deemed to be moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Art Unit: 2614

**Conclusion**

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Olisa Anwah whose telephone number is 571-272-7533. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 8.30 AM to 6 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fan Tsang can be reached on 571-272-7547. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 571-273-8300 for regular communications and 571-273-8300 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-2600.

O.A.

Olisa Anwah  
Patent Examiner  
August 9, 2006



FAN TSANG  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600